

## Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee

Request for Proposal #57340  
Restoration and Design Plan of  
The Grand Trunk Wetland

Addendum #1  
October 5, 2012

**THIS ADDENDUM TO THE SPECIFICATION IS ISSUED TO MODIFY, CLARIFY OR CORRECT THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS AND IS HEREBY MADE A PART OF SAID DOCUMENTS.**

### Questions and Answers:

Thank you for your interest and questions. We've grouped them by topic. It's important that you look at these answers because in some cases they might represent refinements, as well as mere clarifications.

### PRODUCTS

1. On Page 4 under C. Products, the deliverables are to include; 1. Concept Plans and 3. Landscape Plans and Profiles (including grading plans and environment/habitats). However, on Page 11 Products, the Landscape Plans are called "Preliminary" plans. Please confirm that these plans are in fact Preliminary, what level of detail you expect on the plans (i.e. 30%, 60%, 90%), and that these plans are not expected to be "Biddable" or "construction" plans and specifications.
2. The wetland plan is variously described as Preliminary Design, Final Concept plan-drawing, and profile drawing to 1 foot elevation – these seem to be different levels of work. Please define further.

**By preliminary design we mean a 30% level of detail, sufficient to address technical issues regarding grades and costs, but not final construction drawings or final grading plan, and also not just a conceptual plan. All sub-areas are to be preliminary designed to the same level of detail.**

3. Stream- not clear if it is concept design or final design, and is stream/wetland plan at same level of design or is the stream plan more complete, and the wetland less so?
4. It is not clear in many sections if it relates to stream, wetland or both- for example, in Task 4 on page 13, is this a creek and a wetland or only a wetland? Is the creek a "sub- area"?

**The inlet, stream, banks and wetland are all parts of this project and may be defined as sub-areas. All should be at the same level of 30% design.**

5. Under C. Products, the RFP states: The Consultant shall provide services and deliverables as noted under Tasks one Through Twelve in the Scope of Services (attached), including but not limited to the following: . . . . There are only nine tasks under the referenced Scope of Services. Please clarify.

**There are nine (9) tasks in the Scope of Services, not twelve (12).**

6. Under Task 1. Subtask 3 (Map bulkheads and property lines), are you looking for a formal boundary survey? This could be a rather expensive endeavor to undertake for the level of designed for which you are asking.

**Extensive surveying is not part of this RFP. If we find that more than a few hours of surveying is necessary, we'll use city forces outside of this RFP's budget.**

7. Under Task 1. Subtask 4 (Investigate cultural resources and Archaeology), are you anticipating a Phase 1 archaeological investigation pursuant to Section 106, or a more cursory investigation?

**Yes.**

8. Please confirm six meetings will be required per Task 2.

**Confirmed. Other communications can be arranged through the project manager.**

9. Under Task 3, are you assuming that material will be spoiled on site? Or off site? If off site, do you have a list of potential sites where it might be spoiled?

**The study will need to confirm the feasibility of that approach.**

10. Under Task 7, the consultant is asked to address the "Importance and applicability to NOAA goals." Do you have specific NOAA goals for this site? Are you referring to general NOAA goals for the Great Lakes? Or are you referring to specific delisting criteria per the Milwaukee River Estuary RAP?

**Specific criteria will be developed for this project and they will seek to satisfy delisting criteria per the Milwaukee River Estuary per the as RAP.**

11. Under Task 8, are you requiring that multi-spectral imagery be used for monitoring? Or recommending it?

**Task 8 calls for discussing and documenting the merits of various monitoring methods and data in a memo.**

12. In total, how many reports are to be delivered, and what are their titles?

**Products on p. 11 can be chapters in a report or appendices to a report.**

13. The discussion of Phasing on Page 19 states that Final Design, including contractor drawings, restoration and construction of the creek are not part of the current RFP. However, a timeline for Phase 2 is included under Project Timeline on page 20. The description of Phase 2 in the first paragraph on page 20 includes contractor drawings. Is Phase 2 part of a future RFP?
14. Does Phase 3 include detailed wetland restoration design with a drawing set for contractor bidding and construction management of the restoration?

**This RFP is for Phase 1. Phases 2 and 3 are part of a future RFP.**

## EXISTING INFORMATION SOURCES

15. Where can we access the Inputs listed on pages 11 and 12?

**Input #1, the comprehensive area plan, can be found under the Southeast Side heading at <http://city.milwaukee.gov/Plansandstudies/AreaPlans.htm>**

**See attached for more information:**

**Input #2, the delineation, is provided on the website along with this document.**

**The following are provided on the website along with this document:**

**Input #5-1, Soil Analytic Results. Note that the dotted brown line is for 88 micrograms per kilogram and the dashed green line is 200 micrograms per kilogram. Soils in area "A" on p. 25 of site leased to an industrial user are not part of this RFP.**

**Input #5-2, map showing 1 foot contours, parcel boundaries, and cross section of geotech test borings.**

**Input #5-3, geotech test borings**

**Input #5-4 groundwater flow (in light blue).**

**Input#6 Gillen plans in the area of the stream.**

16. Under Task 1. Subtask 2 (Existing Environmental Conditions), the RFP references “secondary sources” of data. Can you provide us with the listed data?

**This is the responsibility of the consultant. Where the team knows of useful information, we will provide, but no promises.**

17. Have the areas and thicknesses of fill soils been mapped?

**Yes.**

18. Has the soil quality been evaluated in terms of nutrients, salinity and other factors that could affect plant viability?

**Not that we know of.**

19. Is the survey to 1 foot contour, not just taken off GIS mapping?

**We have a paper map of a survey with 1-foot contours and a topo map in our GIS system.**

20. Are property boundaries located? Whose responsibility are these?

**Yes. See Input#5-3 above.**

21. Are all adjacent properties notified and supportive?

**They will be included in the advisory group.**

22. What are “Gillen plans” on page 12?

**Gillen is the lessor immediately to the north of the wetland. They have a project with which our project needs to coordinate. A draft plan is Input#6 above.**

23. Does the Port of Milwaukee have any old documents regarding the property? For example: old aerial photos, plat maps, atlases, construction or demolition plans, grading plans, a list of companies that may have had buildings on the site.

**Phase I and II Environmental Assessments have been done on the site and contain pertinent information.**

24. Has local groundwater or surface water level been logged in and adjacent to the wetland and adjacent to the creek discharge point?

**A groundwater contour map has been prepared for the site.**

25. Is there a model of wave propagation into the area of the creek outflow?

**Not that we know of.**

26. Has a cleanup objective been established for benzo(a)pyrene in the soils?

**No. That would be part of the remedial action plan.**

27. Are there electronic or accessible copies of the Giles report and the Gillen plans? Is the topographic map digital file online?

**We can't provide all the Giles and Gillen plans on line, but they would be made available to the consultant as part of the study. The inputs listed above contain a contour map and Gillen plan for the stream area.**

28. Is the Grand Trunk Wetland accessible for to go out and look at the site?

**You can see much of it from the road. The main part is behind a locked fence.**

## **FUNDING**

29. In addition to the grant, what are the funding sources for this project?

**The Fund for Lake Michigan and Wisconsin Coastal Management Program have provided funding to date. We anticipate seeking NOAA GLRI funding to complete the project.**

30. Under Task 6, is the consultant's share (\$15,000) of the \$30,000 Coastal grant in addition to the \$50,000 NTE budget, or part of that budget?
31. On Page 5 it is stated that "The Consultant must provide an all-inclusive cost proposal including fees and reimbursables in an amount not to exceed \$50,000". And on page 14 under Task 6 it states "This Task is supported by a \$30,000 grant from the Wisconsin Coastal Management program and is split evenly between the Consultant and SARUP". Is this to be interpreted that the Consultant has \$15,000 allocated toward Task 6 and an additional \$35,000 for the rest of the Tasks (for a total of \$50,000); or that the Consultant has \$15,000 for Task 6 and \$50,000 for the remaining tasks (for a total of \$65,000)?

32. Section VI. A. 3. of the RFP (pg 5) states that project costs are not to exceed \$50,000. Task 6 of the Scope of Services in the RFP (pg 14) states that the \$30,000 grant is to be split evenly between the consultant and SARUP. Is the \$30,000 grant part of the \$50,000 cap? Is the consultant's portion of the grant (\$15,000) part of the \$50,000 cap?

**\$15,000 is for task 6 and \$35,000 is for the rest, totaling \$50,000.**

33. Can you provide a copy of the grant workplan or provide a link to the document?

**Background information on the project starting on Page 16 is essentially the work plan for the Fund for Lake Michigan grant.**

34. Can we access or be provided a copy of the Wisconsin Coastal Management grant application? Was the grant application prepared by City staff? If others were involved, please identify.

**Task 6 on P. 14 essentially states the work plan for the Wisconsin Coastal Management Grant. Prepared by city staff with the help of the team.**

35. Who wrote the NOAA grant? Written in-house or by Consultant?

**Information generated by this study will be used to apply for a NOAA grant. Grants to this point were written in-house.**

36. Is GLRI money anticipated to be utilized for future phases?

**Yes.**

37. Has the City undertaken projects of similar scope in the past? If yes, what was the project and with whom did the City work?

**No.**

#### **SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

38. Is there a page limitation for the Proposal. If so, does this include appendices?

39. The RFP states (pg 5) that "None of the following should exceed one page in length." Is that to say that we have only one page to "Explain the Consultant team's planning process, and how it will develop innovative, diverse and practical recommendations" and "information about the Consultant's experience in working on similar projects. Information should include project summaries, descriptions of the firm/individual's involvement in the projects, references for these projects, the dates the work was performed, whether the office proposed for this contract was the servicing office, and whether key persons assigned to these projects are still with the firm and available to work on this project." ? (RFP item 4. page 5)

40. Does that also mean that the staffing, experience, qualifications, assignments, involvement (hours) and subcontractors information (RFP item 5. page 6) is also all to be on one page?

**Page 5 of the RFP, Section VI. A states, "None of the following should exceed one page in length." We won't hold proposals to this requirement, but brevity is appreciated. It does not include appendices.**

41. At the top of Page 6, the City asks for "a sample of work demonstrating the writing and editing ability of the key consultant staff". What do you intend that we submit? We assume you want a complete final report or design document for a similar project to show the writing or design abilities? But how do you want us to show the editing capabilities?

**Your assumption is correct. Don't worry about your editing. Please include a link to a document that shows some of your relevant work. You don't need to send paper copies of reports or CD's.**

42. I am certified as a Women owned business by the Department of Commerce and am a DBE with the Unified DOT, Mil. County, Dane County and Madison certification. Would the City of Milwaukee recognize me as a DBE?

**Please know that in order for Small Business Participation (SBE) to be counted towards the 18% goal, the SBE must be certified by the City of Milwaukee. If your firm is not already certified with the City of Milwaukee and is interested in obtaining such certification, please go to the link below and contact staff at the City's Office of Small Business Development.**

<http://city.milwaukee.gov/osbd>

ALL PROPONENTS SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF ADDENDUM NUMBER 1 (DATED October 5, 2012) FOR REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #57340, BY SIGNING IN THE SPACE PROVIDED AND SUBMITTING THE SIGNED ADDENDUM WITH YOUR REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL. PROPOSALS SUBMITTED WITHOUT THIS ADDENDUM MAY BE CONSIDERED NON-RESPONSIVE.

SIGNED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMPANY NAME